DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 043 SO 008 932

AUTHOR Hayden, Rose L.
TITLE International Education: Putting Up or Shutting Up.
PUB DATE 19 Feb 75
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association (Washington, D.C., February 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Improvement; *Educational Needs; Educational Problems; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Relations; *Global Approach; Higher Education; *International Education; Speeches; World Affairs

ABSTRACT

The current status, problems, and future trends of education for global awareness are outlined. Currently, global realities and interdependencies are such that traditional assumptions about international affairs and education are no longer operative. Nor is international education as a discipline conceptually or structurally responding to contemporary challenges. The priorities of international educators are curiously inverted so that attention to state, local, and institutional legitimacy is superseded by a disproportionate emphasis on seeking federal support, disciplinary benediction, and political abstraction. Yet compelling survival, humanitarian, and cultural reasons make the need for stronger international education programs imperative. Internationalist scholars must design new curricular and research models which will yield pertinent new insights and provide a base of relevant expertise which can be utilized by government and professional groups in policy making. They must integrate international programs into every curriculum, produce paraprofessionals who can take an international dimension into the public domain, raise professional standards, become active and aware of political realities at the local level, and reward professional endeavors for improving the discipline. (Author/DE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED120043

SP008 932

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: PUTTING UP OR SHUTTING UP

by

DR. ROSE L. HAYDEN
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROJECT

Ladies and gentlemen, misters and mses, doctors and dses, you have before you a member of that singularly unsung species known as the after-dinner speaker (gluteus garrulous). Its mating call can be characterized as a monotonous drone, punctuated by occasional attempts at humor and even briefer excursions into the realm of thought - and action - provoking discourse. One would think that this alone would have sterilized the cuckoo and rendered it extinct. Unfortunately, this is not the case. The brute fact remains that the banquet speaker continues to rise from its ashes in Phoenix, in Philadelphia, in Wabash and most regularly, in Washington.

Lest I neglect to learn from my collective experience of years of being the "speakee" and not the "speakor," let me, at the outset, assure you that I shall be brief if not brilliant, and wish to leave you with only these three basic thoughts:

(1) global realities and interdependencies are such that traditional assumptions about international affairs are no longer operative;

(2) international education is not conceptually or structurally responding to contemporary challenges; and

(3) the priorities of international educators are curiously inverted so that attention to state, local, and institutional legitimacy is superseded by a disproportionate emphasis on seeking federal support, disciplinary benediction, and political abstraction.

By all rights, now that I have made my three points, a disquieting trinity at best, I should spare you the rest and just sit down. I continue, however, with hopes that the thoughtful listener will benefit from some amplification of these themes. Those of you with more active fantasy lives are free to indulge your fancies unmolested. You have already heard what I have to say.

Theme One: The Multilateral Imperative

Certainly, in this not-the-best-of-all-possible worlds, a creature from outer space would marvel at man's preference for tribal and smalltown allegiances in the face of global interdependencies and the proliferation of nuclear powers. Brute fact has yet to modify the last century's doctrine of absolute national sovereignty, with its veneration of the omnipotent and isolated nation-state.

New nations emerge, converts to a crumbling faith. More established, wealthier states suddenly and painfully learn that traditional international strategies are no longer operative; that

Palestinian guerillas destroy European airports; that military satellites violate national borders with impunity; that Kuwait is closer to the neighborhood gas station than the corner grocery; that acupuncture cures the ailing; that the price of beef in the generally rain-rich United States reflects population pressures of a drought-stricken Africa; that distant wars impoverish and polarize; and that there is no escape from an anxious and fretful world out there and a disgruntled citizenry right here.

As Harlan Cleveland underscores in a provocative essay entitled "The Management of Multilateralism," critical national decisions can only be realized transnationally. Thus, key needs, such as peacekeeping; the design of nuclear safeguards; the policing of terrorism; planetary bargaining on energy, food and commodities; the preservation of the enviroment; the limitation of population; the control of multinational corporations; all require multilateral solutions. In sum, the management of interdependence is increasingly a multilateral process.

Unhappily for us, the stark reality of our times has yet to undo two erroneous assumptions. One is the "us/them" syndrome. We continue to separate "foreign policy" from "domestic policy" in our governmental and academic thinking and structures. Second, we continue to place the emphasis of our diplomacy on bilateral relations. It is, in Harlan Cleveland's words, "a mathematics without the zero."

It is, in my analogy, Papal diplomacy without the Pope.

Fact: There are approximately 150 countries in the world, of which 135 belong to the United Nations. It is a polycentric world, and the bulk of our so-called bilateral diplomacy is in actuality multilateral in its content. Last year alone, the U.S. government was officially represented at 740 international meetings and conferences. In addition, several thousand private international meetings took place. Whereas one is bound to agree with Robert Heilbroner's thesis that concern with survival will enhance authoritarian nationalism and as a consequence will inhibit our facing global challenges as an international brotherhood of men, one is equally forced to accept the fact that survival itself is a global challenge.

How is it, to quote a recent editorial in Change Magazine, that those American institutions with the most interest vested in the next century - the country's colleges and universities - the game as elsewhere, is business as usual? Yes, Virginia, one million academics can be wrong. They are not preparing their 10 million students for a global world of startling new complexities.

Your own colleague, James Rosenau, does not mince words in his forceful article, "Assessment in International Studies: Ego Trip or Feedback?" He recognizes the malaise and admits that the

field of international studies is suffering from an exhaustion of ideas, perhaps from a lack of anything better to do. Rosenau asks: "What do we know about the dynamics of international life that is new and important? Could it be that our methodological progress has led us nowhere?" He argues that we are victims of what he terms the First Law of Social Dynamics, we see only what we want to see, that our capability, game-theoretic, policy-making and systemic models are insufficient to the practice of world politics in the 1970's.

Physicists have moved beyond Einstein, who destroyed the innocence of time and space; psychiatrists have moved beyond Freud, who destroyed the innocence of the mind; socialists and communists have moved beyond Marx, who destroyed the innocence of the state; biological scientists have moved beyond Darwin, who destroyed the innocence of nature.* Have internationalists moved beyond the early works of Morgenthau, Kaplan and Snyder? Who will destroy our innocence? Certainly not the mediocrats and technocrats whose complex research methodology and statistical sophistry reduces the utility of their inquiry, hence their audience to less than a dozen people similarly inclined.

In the area of policy relevance, Rosenau admits that we have no knowledge of the kind of policy guidance which scholars have

* Adapted from Stanley Kunitz, "A Kind of Order," in The New Republic, January 18, 1975.

provided, let alone of the uses made of this information. This Tuesday, a small group of leading educators and scholars will be meeting with Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. (Unqualified as leading scholar or educator, I, too, shall be present) The meeting represents a follow-up on the part of the International Education Project to a very provocative interview which Kissinger had with Scott Reston and which appeared in the October 13, 1974 issue of the New York Times.

In that interview, Kissinger admitted that he has a goal, which is to turn the Department of State into an institution which can serve succeeding Presidents and succeeding secretaries of state. The personnel problem: how to turn bureaucratic operators into intellectual leaders in the field of foreign policy. The conceptual challenge: how to move beyond the relics of the postwar period toward a new international structure, a new perception of where America fits into the scheme of things.

When Kissinger turns to us next Tuesday for specific advice and counsel, do we have anything of substance to offer? It is Kissinger's hope that we do not fall into any of his three categories of intellectuals, namely:

... those that reject the Government totally

... those that work on pure, abstract intellectual models which are impossible to make relevant

7/

> ... those too close to power who want
> to be involved in day-to-day tactics
> where they are unable to contribute
> appropriate solutions to larger issues

Kissinger exhorts us to ask important questions, to provide a "middle-term perspective." He wants to restore mutual confidence between the professor and the policy-maker and to establish an authentic place in foreign affairs for the scholar.

Again I turn to you and ask, in all sincerity, do we have anything really meaningful to say to this man? Anything truly pertinent to these needs? It is a classic case of put up, or shut up.

Theme Two: International Education: More of the Same Just Ain't Enough;

More is spent on international programs in the United States than many countries have in entire education budgets. Even so, it is not enough. Yet despite gaps and deficiencies in functional areas which make up the field, the fact remains that much has been accomplished. The wealth and spread of international education across the educational map has done much to mitigate parochialism in American higher education. Few scholars today would echo young Santayana's description of the non-Western world as being made up of "interminable ocean spaces, coconut islands, blameless Malays, and immense continents swarming with Chinamen, polished and industrious, obscene and philosophical." About the citizenry at large, one cannot be so sure.

While there is reason to be encouraged at the range and vigor of activities which cluster under the descriptive umbrella, "international education," the truth is that accomplishment has secured neither a steady nor adequate level of support. Just as the beach is strewn with shells and debris after a storm, so does the educational seascape reveal the hulks of program vessels caught on the reefs of public indifference and professional fadism. Somehow, the timeliness and utility of international education has washed ashore in recent years.

International studies, like foreign aid, has few defenders anymore among the populace, businessmen, educators and other professionals, to say nothing of the media, legislators, bureaucrats or foundation officials. When World War II pushed America into a world leadership role, and Sputnik shocked us to our very bones, a combination of forces led to a broad push to develop and sustain a cadre of experts. These professionals knowledgeable about other peoples and cultures, were trained, in theory at least, to apply their analytical skills to international events. The hope was that their insights would help avoid any intolerable surprises which would threaten our national security and, by extension, that of the so-called developed world of the Western bloc.

Major legislation, NDEA Title VI, Fulbright-Hays and the International Education Act was passed. Some was funded. Foundations

moved aggressively on to center stage and supported scholarly research, exchange, academic and development initiatives. As long as generous external funding was the prevailing perception, if not overall reality, the imbalance in international programs, the ambiguous relationship of international, multi-disciplinary studies with established disciplines and academic modes, the near-sighted focus on idiosyncratic studies, and the neglect of public, professional and adult education never surfaced. Given external funding and tacit dependence on the Cold War rationale, internationalists engaged in hitherto unimagined intellectual pursuits and created competencies where none had previously existed before.

But the world, as it is wont to do, changed. Failure to fund the International Education Act of 1966 blunted the edge of a movement many educators accepted as worthy of their deepest professional support. The foundations hastened the erosion of financing by shifting attention from foreign to domestic concerns. Pressures of inflation and declining enrollments led to cutbacks of so-called "non-essential programs." Today, hard money is scarce and soft money must be mined through different shafts. Never before in the history of the field has so little been expected to accomplish so much, has global reality demanded so much of so few.

Rising domestic tensions, failures in Viet Nam, disenchantment with the United Nations, disillusion with foreign aid (a mere 0.2% of our GNP), neoisolationism, and just plain apathy, along with

dwindling economic resources, characterize the present scene. With public support and external funding on the wane, little wonder the internationalist feels that he has bitten a bullet and a half. While it is conceivable that just as Sputnik stimulated an era of growth in international education, the Arab boycott will create new support for world problem studies, there is little hard evidence to date that this hypothesis will be operationally proven. With near theological zeal, U.S. educators relentlessly view their pedagogical mission as one of "Americanizing" a multinational population. The "melting pot" bubbles away, though today, 1975, one of every five new Americans is an immigrant.

Yet there are compelling reasons for nurturing a capacity to learn about and experience other cultures. The first reason we Americans must globalize education is elemental -- survival. We must sustain informed connections in order to survive, if not to prosper.

A second reason is humanitarian. If the "haves" of the world do not care and share, we will have little claim to self-decency in a desperate and starving world. Experts already predict 150 million famine deaths a year by 1980. It would be as if three of every four Americans today would die before Guy Lumbardo's orchestra ushered in 1976.

The third reason for attempting, through education, to relate to all peoples and cultures is the need for shared brain-power. Historically, America is the product of brains imported from abroad, of persons escaping from tyrannies, pogroms and famines. We need the best-of-all possible minds if we hope to mitigate the seemingly intractable problems of mankind: energy, population, pollution, urban sprawl, disease, discrimination and injustice, hunger, and war. The list is long and lead-time is all too short.

Even if security, compassion and human survival were not at issue, other - culture learning would be prescribed as the insulin to counteract what one observor termed "the excess sugar of a diabetic culture." While Americans may be physically overfed and overweight, we are aesthetically starved. Thrills and violence, not beauty and reflection, abound, making us all fretful and anxious.

One way to avert a national nervous breakdown is to educate children to be aware of the dazzling diversity of cultural expression around the world and within our own national borders. Full appreciation of such facets of existence as music, drama, dance, costume, sports, cooking, gardening, religious rites and literature is unattainable without an education which opens the mind and cultivates taste.*

Theme Three: International Education Begins at Home

Many implications for strengthening and improving international education emerge from the foregoing remarks, and in the interests of time, let me list these succinctly:

*Adapted from an address by Dr. Stephen K. Bailey presented on October 21, 1974 in Lincoln, Nebraska

(1) Response to International Needs

> Internationalist scholars must design new curricular and research models which will yield pertinent insights and knowledge about multilateral modes of conducting interstate relations. They must apply greater intellectual energies in projects which are focused on the search for solutions to the overarching global problems of mankind.

(2) Response to National Needs

> Internationalist scholars must provide a base of relevant expertise which can be utilized by government and professional groups in policy - relevant, and operationally key areas. They must dedicate much more effort to meeting the need for an internationally sophisticated citizenry capable of understanding and acting responsibly in national and world affairs.

To meet these admittedly broad objectives, international educators must, among other tasks:

> ... close campus gaps. There is simply no guarantee, as experience has amply shown, that language and international programs will automatically mesh on a campus. Campus gaps, like the Snake River Canyon, require daredevils equipped and brave enough to make the jump. Without professional and financial parachutes, there are few volunteers.

> ... design curricular and administrative programs aimed at producing paraprofessionals, that is, persons who as liaison, mid-level types can: (1) tie international studies inputs into teacher and public education for international understanding and sophistication; and (2) link the international and areas studies dimensions with the technical, problem or topical studies domain.

... assess critically the nature of international studies education as it is now structured and raise professional standards. It is palpably ironic that many of the so-called best programs in a field clearly tied to multicultural expertise have dropped language requirements for student majors.

... become active and savvy about political realities at local and state levels. Even in the heyday of outside funding, federal funds accounted for about 10%, foundation funds 5%, of the financial investment in international education. The lion's share, or 85% - was and continues to be paid by local and state monies, both public and private. When is the last time you talked to a state legislator or took a trustee to lunch?

... reward professional endeavors and provide incentives to faculty involved in these, as well as traditional research and teaching functions.

Let me conclude, now, with a few general comments on the role of the critical intellect whose task it is to distinguish the good from the bad, the genuine from the specious, the useful from the trivial. Arthur Koestler, in his new book The Heel of Achilles, is fearful that we have compromised our chances for survival, largely through our collective dependence upon professional orthodoxies. Contemporary man, in his eyes, is "a genius in mastering nature, a moron in conducting human affairs."

The Germans have a term, Die Wissenschaft des nicht Wissenswerten which, in simple translation means "the science of what is not worth knowing." It is a false science, and should not impede internationalist scholars from acting on their better instincts for humanity, instead of merely studying them.

For the first time in the history of our field, there is a convergence of our need to survive and our conceptual musings about global affairs. The continued existence of international studies programs is organically linked to our ability to contend with the present and to meet the future in ways which promise to fulfill and deepen our sense of national purpose, to strengthen our bonds with all peoples, and to enhance our prospects for a genuine reign of peace and human dignity.

Let it not be said of us, as Gibbon said of Constantine, that as we, international educators, gradually advanced in the knowledge of truth, we proportionately declined in the practice of virtue.

Patient listeners all, I thank you very much.